

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-42 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1-3 and 6-42 are amended. Claims 4-5 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 43-44 are added. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

### **Drawing Objections**

The Examiner indicates that the drawings are not of sufficient quality to permit examination.

Replacement sheets for the drawings (i.e., figures 1-6) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are submitted with this response.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

### **Objections to the Specification**

The Examiner indicates that the recitation of "relay" in p. 1, line 26 of the specification is a typo and should be replaced with "rely". The Examiner further indicates that the recitation of "BURL" in p. 11, line 2 of the specification is a typo and should be replaced with "URL".

The specification has been amended above to replace the recitation of "relay" in p. 1, line 26 of the specification with "rely". The specification has been further amended above to replace the recitation of "a BURL" in p. 11, line 2 of the specification with "an URL".

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the specification is respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1, 23, 26-30, 32-33, and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,105,055 to Pizano, as set forth by the Examiner in pages 3-6 of the Office Action.

It is respectfully submitted that Pizano does not disclose *selecting a plurality of source documents using an user interface, selecting a page from each of the selected source documents*

using the user interface, adding an annotation to a designated part of each of the selected pages using the user interface, and combining the annotated pages into a collaboration document using the interface, as essentially recited in amended claim 1. Claim 1 allows participants to combine specific elements from several documents with different formats into one seamless composite collaboration document.

Pizano teaches use of an annotation editor 14 to annotate individual source documents by adding text, graphics, or voice comments to the document (See col. 4, lines 17-21). The annotation is then sent to a DC manager 18 through email by selecting a “DC” button on the annotation editor. (See col. 4, lines 28-33). The annotation editor 14 allows a reviewer to add further annotations to the document (See col. 5, lines 42-46).

However, as opposed to the user interface of claim 1, the annotation editor 14 does not enable a single user to annotate pages from different source documents and combine the annotated pages into a single collaboration document during a single session. For example, the editor 14 does not provide a user with a function to select pages from different documents. Further, the document generated by the editor 14 does not include annotated pages from multiple source documents.

Claim 43 is added to depend from claim 1 and recites *wherein the plurality of source documents include at least two source documents of different data formats*. As discussed above, the annotation editor 14 of Pizano does not enable a collaboration document to be generated from multiple source documents. Thus, it follows that Pizano also does not teach generation of a collaboration document from source documents of at least two different data formats.

Claim 44 is added to depend from claim 1 and recites *sending a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) linked to the collaboration document to at least one of the plurality of users using*

the user interface, wherein selection of the received URL by the user, enables the user to access the collaboration document using a local web browser. Pizano teaches (in col. 4, lines 28-38) sending an annotation in an email to a DC manager on a central server and use of an URL to point to a location at which the annotation of a single document is stored. However, as opposed to claim 44, the message is not sent to a user using the user interface that enables annotation. For example, FIG. 1 of Pizano shows that the clients 10 using the annotation editor 14 sending the annotation to a central server 12, and not to another user.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1, 43 and 44 are believed not anticipated by Pizano. Thus claims 1, 43 and 44 are believed to be patentable over Pizano.

Claim 23 and 36 are believed to be patentable over Pizano for at least similar reasons to claim 1. For example, claims 23 and 36 are amended to recite selecting a plurality of source documents using the user interface, selecting a page from each of the selected source documents using the user interface, adding a browser based annotation to a designated part of each of the selected pages using the user interface, combining the annotated pages into a collaboration document using the interface.

It is respectfully submitted that Pizano does not disclose, associating user-entered data with a document page, first and second users establishing an instant message communication for a collaboration, and said first and second users optionally modifying said user-entered data using the established instant message communication. as essentially recited in amended claim 26.

The Examiner contends that Pizano teaches establishing message communication among users for a collaboration and users modifying data associated with a document. However, users in Pizano do not communicate directly with one another using instant messages. For example,

Pizano teaches a user annotating a document and sending the annotation to a DC manager 18 on a remote server using email (in col. 4, lines 28-38), and another user accessing the annotation by connecting to a newsgroup server 20 (in col. 4, lines 55-64).

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 26 is believed not anticipated by Pizano. Thus claim 26 is believed to be patentable over Pizano. Claims 27-30 and 32 are believed to be patentable over Pizano at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 26.

Claims 33 and 35 are believed to be patentable over Pizano for at least similar reasons to claim 1. For example, claims 33, 35 and 36 are amended to recite means for selecting a plurality of source documents using the user interface, means for selecting a page from each of the selected source documents using the user interface, means for adding an annotation to a designated part of each of the selected pages using the user interface, and means for combining the annotated pages into a collaboration document using the interface.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103**

1. Claims 2-16, 24-25 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pizano, in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0023679 to Johnson, as set forth by the Examiner in pages 7-11 of the Office Action.

Claims 4 and 5 are cancelled without prejudice.

The above 103 rejections of claims 2-3, 6-16, 24-25 and 31 are premised, in part, on the Examiner's reliance on Pizano as disclosing all elements of claims 1, 23, and 26, where claims 2-16 depend from claim 1, claims 24-25 depend from claim 23, and claim 31 depends from claim 26. However, Pizano does not disclose all of the limitations of claims 1, 23, and 26 for at least the reasons discussed above. For example, Pizano does not disclose selecting a plurality of

source documents using an user interface, selecting a page from each of the selected source documents using the user interface, adding an annotation to a designated part of each of the selected pages using the user interface, and combining the annotated pages into a collaboration document using the interface or associating user-entered data with a document page, first and second users establishing an instant message communication for a collaboration, and said first and second users optionally modifying said user-entered data using the established instant message communication.

Further, the deficiencies of Pizano regarding the above limitations are not cured by Johnson. For example, Johnson merely teaches (in paragraphs [0073-0075] and FIG. 2) a embedding annotations into XML documents and transferring the XML documents between clients using email. Accordingly, the combination of Pizano and Johnson cannot render obvious claims 2-16, 24-25 and 31.

2. Claims 17-22 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pizano, in view of U.S. Patent 6,437,818 to Ludwig, as set forth by the Examiner in pages 12-14 of the Office Action.

Claims 17 and 34 are not disclosed or suggested by Pizano and Ludwig. First, as discussed above, Pizano does not disclose means for selecting a plurality of source documents using the user interface, means for selecting a page from each of the selected source documents using the user interface, means for adding an annotation to a designated part of each of the selected pages using the user interface, and means for combining the annotated pages into a collaboration document using the interface (e.g., means such a user interface). Further, the deficiencies of Pizano in this regard are not cured by Ludwig. For example, Ludwig merely teaches a video conferencing system using UDP (in abstract).

Claims 18-22 are believed to be patentable over Pizano and Ludwig at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 17.

3. Claims 37-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pizano, in view of U.S. Patent 6,687,878 to Eintracht, as set forth by the Examiner in pages 7-11 of the Office Action.

The above 103 rejections of claims 37-42 are premised, in part, on the Examiner's reliance on Pizano as disclosing all elements of claim 36. However, Pizano does not disclose all of the limitations of claim 36 for at least the reasons discussed above. For example, Pizano does not disclose *selecting a plurality of source documents using the user interface, selecting a page from each of the selected source documents using the user interface, adding an annotation to a designated part of each of the selected pages using the user interface, and combining the annotated pages into a collaboration document using the interface.* Further, the deficiencies of Pizano in this regard is not cured by Eintracht. For example, Eintracht merely teaches (in FIG. 1A-C, col. 2, lines 47-55) a user annotating individual documents, but not combination of annotated pages from multiple source documents into a collaboration document.

Accordingly, the combination of Pizano and Eintracht cannot render obvious claims 37-42.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By: Donald B. Paschburg  
Donald B. Paschburg  
Reg. No. 33,753  
Attorney for Applicant

**Correspondence Address:**

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830  
(732) 321-3191